

**AT A PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING OF THE HAMPTON PLANNING COMMISSION HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL, HAMPTON, VIRGINIA, ON AUGUST 12, 2002 AT 3:30 P.M.**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Perry T. Pilgrim, Vice-Chairman Ralph A. Heath, III, and Commissioners Katherine K. Glass, Harold O. Johns, and Randy Gilliland

**ABSENT:** Timothy B. Smith and George E. Wallace

**ROLL CALL**

A call of the roll noted Commissioners Smith and Wallace as being absent.  
(NOTE: Commissioner Smith and Wallace were present during Item No. IV.)

**ITEM I. MINUTES**

There being no additions or corrections, a motion was made by Commissioner Ralph A. Heath, III, and seconded by Commissioner Harold O. Johns, to approve the minutes of the July 8, 2002 Planning Commission meeting. A roll call vote on the motion resulted as follows:

AYES:	Johns, Heath, Glass, Gilliland, Pilgrim
NAYS:	None
ABST:	None
ABSENT:	Smith, Wallace

**ITEM II. RESOLUTION IN HONOR OF COUNCIL MEMBER RHET TIGNOR**

**RESOLUTION IN RECOGNITION OF  
COMMISSIONER RHET TIGNOR**

WHEREAS: Rhet Tignor has faithfully served as a member of the Hampton City Planning Commission from his appointment on June 30, 2001 to June 30, 2002; and

WHEREAS: Rhet Tignor dutifully fulfilled his role as the City Council Representative on the Commission and appropriately conveyed the Commission's deliberations of all issues to the City Council; and

WHEREAS: During his tenure the Planning Commission's considerations included significant community participation; and

WHEREAS: Rhet Tignor has consistently kept the concerns of the general citizenry in the forefront of the Commission's deliberations and has continually searched out innovative solutions to community conflicts; and

WHEREAS: Rhet Tignor has honorably and generously given of his time to represent the Planning Commission before numerous bodies; and

WHEREAS: The Planning Commission, Planning staff, and the citizens of Hampton have benefited tremendously from Rhet Tignor's encouragement during his tenure on the Commission, and express appreciation to Mr. Tignor for his guidance and support of all planning efforts.

WHEREAS: Members of the Commission and staff sincerely respect and hold Commissioner Tignor in the highest personal and professional regard.

NOW, THEREFORE, IS IT RESOLVED: by the Hampton City Planning Commission and staff to officially commend Commissioner Rhet Tignor for his outstanding service and to extend their gratitude for his dedication and service to the Hampton Planning Commission.

Given this 12<sup>th</sup> day of August 2002.

---

Perry Pilgrim  
Chairman

---

Terry P. O'Neill  
Secretary to Commission

Commissioner Tignor thanked the Planning staff and Commission for the honor. He stated he had a very good experience in his short tenure with the Planning Commission.

### **ITEM III. YOUTH PLANNER REPORT**

Ms. Alicia Tundidor, Youth Planner, gave the audience a brief overview on the origination of the youth planners and their purpose. She stated during the month of July, the youth planners prepared for the Youth Commission's Annual Boot Camp, which is a three-day event. The event consisted of a variety of activities and assessments to assist the new Commissioners for the upcoming year. Old Commissioners were also in attendance to guide the new ones as well to refresh themselves with the goals. In addition to helping the Commission as a whole, the youth planners and staff helped to train each Comprehensive Plan Subcommittee member regarding the Comprehensive Plan and the work it entails. The Youth Planners and Youth Commission have taken on the task of helping with the implementation of the Hampton Community Plan's Youth Focus Group, which will be discussed further in the near future. She stated they are still in the application process and the amount of interest of prospective youth is overwhelming. She stated they are looking forward to the annual retreat to be held in September and thanked the Commission for their time.

### **ITEM IV. HAMPTON COMMUNITY PLAN**

Mr. O'Neill, Secretary to the Commission, stated staff has added a new agenda item, the Hampton Community Plan, to update the Commission periodically. Staff has laid out a strategy and schedule for putting together the new plan. The schedule has

been on target over the summer with the expectation that in early Fall, staff will begin to go out and initiate the first round of community discussions. Given the roll of the Planning Commission with the statutes in developing the Community Plan, it would be important to keep the Commission abreast of the status without going through details. The Community Plan will be on the agenda on a regular basis and staff is present to give the first glimpse of how the Plan is proceeding. Mr. O'Neill introduced Mr. Keith Cannady, City Planner, Comprehensive Plan Coordinator, who will give a brief update on the Plan, and Ms. Jeryl Phillips, City Planner, working directly with the Youth Advisory Committee, who will update the Commission on their status.

Mr. Keith Cannady stated he will include the community plan status during the presentation of the annual report. Mr. Cannady asked Ms. Phillips to present the Youth Focus Group component of the Hampton Community Plan.

Ms. Jeryl Phillips stated another element that was mentioned when staff provided the overview to the Commission in June was a way to involve young people in our community in this process. She stated when the 2010 Comprehensive Plan was developed in 1989, there was not any structure in place for tapping into the issues affecting youth in our community. Perhaps youth issues were identified by their parents or other adults in the community. Realizing that this issue was lacking in the city's long range plan, a Youth Component to the 2010 Comprehensive Plan was subsequently developed by the Youth Planners, and was adopted as part of the long-range plan for the city. The Youth Planners and Youth Commission have been working to implement various elements of that plan since. Soon thereafter, the development of the Strategic Plan in the mid-late 1990s involved youth participation. However, it was more of an adult focus group sharing what they thought were strategic issues facing our community and asking young people to react to that. Youth were engaged in that process by serving as a barometer of sorts only. In updating these two plans today, we have a real opportunity to involve youth in a meaningful way from the beginning. This will enable them to articulate and discuss their vision for the future of Hampton and in a setting that works best for them, and not just react to adults proposals. Many communities that are also updating their comprehensive plans are seeking to engage youth today, and in Hampton, we are so far along with youth engagement in city government, that we have the capacity in place to get this done and do a really good job. The development for a strategy for youth involvement are: 1) A Youth Focus Group, comprised of a mix of 15 high school students; 2) Two of these focus group members will be liaisons from the Comprehensive Plan Subcommittee, which is a standing committee of the Youth Commission; 3) The group will be staffed with the Youth Planners, Ms. Phillips, and two other staff from the Planning Department, who will facilitate the meetings. Alternatives will be used to help train staff in order to best facilitate these meetings; 4) Meetings will be held approximately twice a month in the evenings, beginning in September, and they will work through this school year; 5) They will work through the same topics that we are asking the adult focus groups to work through, but in a setting surrounded by their peers, conducive to them in speaking out and sharing their ideas; 6) At strategic points throughout the plan update process, the adult focus groups and the youth focus group will meet to share each other's work and to cross-pollinate the discussion of their respective groups; and 7) The Youth Commission will be one of the several community

boards and commissions, such as the Planning Commission, that will be called up to endorse the recommendations of the focus groups.

Ms. Phillips stated in the next step, interviews will be conducted next week to select people to serve on the Youth Focus Group. Approximately 25 people have applied for the interview. Selections will be made the last week of August. The Focus Group members will be invited to attend the September 9 meeting of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission will be asked to formally appoint these members. A list will be included in the September meeting packet. The appointment will be followed by a mandatory orientation held on September 12<sup>th</sup>. The group will begin their work in September. Ms. Phillips stated she looks forward to seeing the Commission at the next meeting and getting started thereafter with the youth. She entertained any questions the Commission had.

In response to a question by Commissioner Johns, Ms. Phillips stated they arrived at no more than 15 high school students because they believed it would be the most manageable group. This number includes two liaisons from the Youth Commission, staffed by the Youth Planners and two staff members of the Planning Department, as well as a liaison from the Peninsula Catholic School in addition to the public schools.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **ITEM V. AMENDMENT OT THE 2010 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL ON 12/13/89**

Chairman Pilgrim read the description of the next agenda items as advertised in the Daily Press on July 29 and August 5, 2002.

**Amendment to the 2010 Comprehensive Plan as adopted by City Council on 12/13/89** by the City of Hampton to amend the transportation element to substitute the proposed Interstate 664 connector road to Armistead Avenue for a package of road improvements that include: a four-lane road; the extension of Coliseum Drive from Pine Chapel Road to Armistead Avenue; a new "link road" from Crossroads Parkway and Freeman Drive to Armistead Avenue at its intersection with Reese Drive; the extension of Coliseum Drive; improvements to the LaSalle Avenue interstate interchange and to Armistead Avenue; and improvements to Queen Street from Briarfield Road to Pine Chapel Road. This proposal would also amend the land use element to change the designation of the area around the Coliseum from community facilities to commercial/mixed-use to permit "The Crossroads Project", a convention center, hotel and commercial complex with public open space.

Mr. O'Neill introduced Mr. Fred Whitley, City Engineer, who will present a technical briefing on what is involved in the amendment to the Commission. Mr. O'Neill stated that no formal action is required on the amendment this day, but members of the audience are welcomed to the podium to solicit their comments. An abbreviated report will be presented at the September meeting and the Planning Commission's recommendation would be forwarded to City Council.

Mr. O'Neill stated the proposed amendment is centered around a project that has been in the city's transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan since 1977. This proposal has commonly been called the "I-664 Connector Road," which involves a ramp project from the intersection of I-64 and I-664 to Armistead Avenue, through what was formally the Pine Chapel public housing project and some adjacent residential areas. The general intent when the project was first put into place was to try to do two things: 1) enhance access to an ever growing Coliseum Central area; and 2) to provide regional access to the Coliseum and the events that occur in and around the Coliseum area. The project was viewed as a multi-directional access off I-64 and I-664. This project has evolved over the years to the point that now in very recently history, the project has serious questions taking place as to whether the project actually fulfills the original intent for which it was placed in the Plan in 1977, and incorporated into that is the ever escalating price of construction of the project. In addition, there are financial difficulties that the State of Virginia finds itself in, which makes staff take a critically hard look at the project which has brought staff to this point today. The Commission is asked to consider an amendment to the plan which staff believes will serve the community and region just as efficiently, but perhaps with a better cost benefit of local expenditures. He introduced Mr. Whitley, Manager of the project, to walk the Commission through the technical aspects of the project.

Mr. Fred Whitley, City Engineer, displayed an aerial photo and gave a description of the road connections of the proposed project. He stated the project was initially conceived in the late 80's, and over time, as other information became available, other projects were planned. The use of this project began to diminish, and as time passed, the price went up. Staff decided to have a transportation study developed by Parsons Transportation Group. Their study, in light of the information available back in 2000, concluded that this project was not economically viable. The amount of money the project would cost, exceeded \$50 million and did not provide the traffic benefits that it should have. In its place, they recommended other improvements at a price tag of \$13 million. As an alternative to improving the Coliseum Central area, the project included: widening Queen Street around the intersection of Briarfield Road up to Powhatan Parkway; improvement access to the interchange which is underway; some re-alignment at Armistead Avenue with a link road going through, which is under design; and improvements at LaSalle and Armistead Avenues. Other improvements to the interchange are: a signal coming off the interstate east-bound at LaSalle Avenue, and a new entrance to the YMCA with a traffic signal; improvements at West Pembroke and LaSalle Avenue; and improvements at I-664 and Powhatan Parkway intersections. The sum total of all projects is approximately \$13 million. This would improve the level of service and reduce traffic time in the Coliseum Central area. For these reasons, city staff believes it makes sense ask the Commission to consider an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

In response to a comment by Commissioner Wallace, Mr. Whitley concurred that the \$50 million comes out of the city's urban allocation by the State, and he agreed that by reducing the cost, and changing the mixture of improvements, this not only gives the city more flexibility to create an opportunity and make better use of other projects.

In response to a question by Commissioner Johns, Mr. Whitley stated money that has been spent for the design to date is lost money. The remainder of the money in the account would go towards the new projects.

In response to a question by Commissioner Pilgrim, Mr. Whitley stated \$1.5 million has been spent on the design study. Approximately half of the money was used on property acquisitions.

In response to a question by Commissioner Pilgrim, Mr. Whitley stated money was appropriated for the property that VDOT purchased, and the city will purchase and receive the value of that land.

In response to a question by Commissioner Johns, Mr. Whitley stated approximately \$500,000 was allocated for the VDOT property which is in the Coliseum Central area and will be valuable, useful land in the long term. If the road is not developed, there are other uses available in the future for redevelopment purposes.

In response to a question by Commissioner Smith, Mr. Whitley stated VDOT has not set a price on the property, but the normal course of business is to sell the property for what they paid for it. They do not try to make a profit.

In response to comments by Commissioners Wallace and Pilgrim, Mr. Whitley showed the Commission on the aerial photo properties that have been acquired, which is parcels along Armistead Avenue, and Barrack Street.

In response to a question by Commissioner Smith, Mr. Whitley showed a cut-out of the convention center and stated the old alignment is independent of the convention center site.

Mr. O'Neill stated staff's view to a large degree is 100% independent of what may happen on the site around the Coliseum. Even if the decision is made not to move forward with the convention center project, staff feels that they will be responsible for providing enough infrastructure and access into the land for some sort of development where the improvements will be warranted. The link road Mr. Whitley described will primarily serve event traffic into and out of the Coliseum. This will provide additional lanes and egress and ingress, so that when it is full, whatever is developed around it, will need additional access into the project. Staff tried to assess what is needed in terms of infrastructure and access irrespective of what the development scenario might be on the property.

In response to a question by Commissioner Gilliland, Mr. Whitley stated the project along Queen Street and LaSalle Avenue would need City Council's endorsement to go to VDOT to include the projects in their 6 year plan. The timing would depend on the City Council's and City Manager's timetable, as well as VDOT's funding cost. VDOT is studying the LaSalle Avenue/I-64 interchange to see if the city's proposal helps the level of service, but some work is underway.

Mr. Jack R. Allen, 1809 N. Armistead Avenue, stated he is one of the property owners in the proposed area, and the link road, the way it is currently designed, has property purchased by the State which is adjacent to his and his neighbors' property. He questioned why the city could not use the State property instead of taking their property.

Mr. Whitley distributed preliminary designs to the Mr. Allen, the Commission and the audience of Armistead Avenue and the link road, a copy attached hereto and made a part hereof, and described where Mr. Allen's house was located. He stated the link road was chosen because it lines up with Reese Drive, and a signalized intersection will be located in that area. If the link road was not located at this specific area, the city would have an off-set from existing intersections with Armistead Avenue which would create a traffic dilemma in terms of turning movements. Another advantage to the Windsor Terrace subdivision, located in that area, is that this would help eliminate the difficulty for residents getting out on Armistead Avenue. He stated the city tried to be as mindful in selecting the alignment, minimizing the number of property owners affected. He stated the city has acquired property adjacent to Mr. Allen which belongs to Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson offered his property to the city because he is relocating. He stated a public hearing was held on the project in May at Thomas Eaton Middle School, and he has talked with people since that time. He stated the general reaction is that most people on Barrack Street wanted to know when the city would buy their property.

In response to a question by Mr. Allen, Mr. Whitley stated the amount of traffic coming in and out of the Coliseum and/or possibly the Convention Center would generate a volume of traffic at peak times. He stated there is not enough lanes on Coliseum Drive, therefore another outlet is needed. The road will have reversible lanes so that traffic can go in and out which will improve traffic circulation.

In response to a question by Mr. Allen, Mr. Whitley stated the plan is to begin right-of-way acquisition this fall and complete it by the spring of 2003.

In response to a question by Mr. Larry Roland, 38 Barrack Street, Mr. Whitley stated the end of Barrack Street would be south of the new road. He stated there is a stub/connection with the link road to provide property owners access to the new road. However, on the north side of the link road, the city does not plan to tie Barrack Street out to the link road because there is access out to Pine Chapel Road.

In response to a question by Commissioner Smith, Mr. Whitley stated the cross section in the proposed Convention Center area would be 5 lanes wide, and at peak times, there would be four lanes in and one lane out in order to maintain access.

In response to a question by Commissioner Pilgrim, Mr. Whitley stated there would have to be a signal light at Armistead Avenue, but as people get closer to the parking lot near the Coliseum, there would be personnel available to direct traffic.

Mr. O'Neill asked the Commission not to take formal action on this day, but if there are additional questions and comments, Mr. O'Neill will forward them to Mr. Whitley. He asked the Commission to take action to defer the amendment of the

transportation element of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan to the September 9, 2002 Planning Commission meeting.

A motion was made by Harold O. Johns, and seconded by Ralph A. Heath, III, to defer the amendment of the transportation element of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan to the September 9, 2002 Planning Commission meeting. A roll call vote on the motion resulted as follows:

AYES:	Smith, Johns, Heath, Glass, Wallace, Gilliland, Pilgrim
NAYS:	None
ABST:	None
ABSENT:	None

#### **ITEM VI. REZONING APPLICATION NO. 1148**

**Rezoning Application No. 1148** by the City of Hampton to rezone 114± acres to Limited Commercial District (C-2) for a convention center, hotel, commercial complex and public open space. Bounded on the south and west by Interstate 64, the area proposed to be rezoned fronts 1713'± on the south side of Pine Chapel Road beginning at the Interstate 64 overpass and extending east, then extends 2250'± south along the rear property lines of the Speegle Village and Wilken Park subdivisions, and then extends east 1625'± east along the rear property lines of the Wilken Park subdivision to North Armistead Avenue. Identified as "The Crossroads" on a composite plat, the parcels are: Parcel 1, 220± acres, zoned Neighborhood Commercial District (C-1); Parcel 2, 0.810± acres, zoned C-1 and One Family Residence District (R-9); Parcel 3, 0.570± acres, zoned One Family Residence District (R-11); Parcel 4, 0.630± acres, zoned R-11; Parcel 5, 0.250± acres, zoned R-11; Parcel A, 69.334± acres, zoned Special Public Interest District-Public Land (SPI-PL); Parcel B, 40.860± acres, zoned Multiple Residence District (R-M), and a 0.664± acre portion of Parcel 6 zoned R-9 and R-M, fronting 26'± on the south side of Pine Chapel Road beginning 375'± east of its intersection with Knickerbocker Circle and extending 995'± south. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan recommends commercial/mixed-use and community facilities for this area. C-2 allows community and regional scale retail and commercial uses, including hotels, and community facilities. C-1 allows retail sales of convenience goods and personal services. R-M allows multi-family dwelling units at no specific density. R-11 allows single family dwelling units at a density of 3.5-4.5 units per acre. R-9 allows single family dwelling units at a density of 5-6.5 units per acre. SPI-PL allows public uses.

Mr. O'Neill stated Rezoning Application No. 1148 was intended to be an accompanied discussion to rezone publicly owned property in and around the Coliseum/ Pine Chapel Village property. This rezoning was intended to set the stage for the development of the Crossroads project as it had been envisioned for the last two years. Less than a month ago, City Council decided there was additional information they wanted to receive prior to moving forward with a final action on the Convention Center/Crossroads project. City Council will receive the information sometime in September and render their opinion to move forward on the project at the September 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. Staff felt it would be premature to move forward with the rezoning

recommendation and public hearing, given the fact that Council may decide to change course and then the property would be rezoned to something that Council may not want on the property. Mr. O'Neill asked the Commission to defer any action on rezoning the property until the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, which is the first public hearing after Council has received the information. At that time, staff and the Commission would have to wait and see what decision Council makes, and will then be in a position to present a staff report and/or particular development plan, or staff may be back to either defer or withdraw the application if there is a change in direction.

In response to a question by Commissioner Pilgrim, Mr. O'Neill stated the only properties involved in this rezoning are properties that are currently in public ownership (i.e. Hampton Redevelopment and Housing Authority and the City of Hampton).

A motion was made by Katherine K. Glass, and seconded by Ralph A. Heath, III, to defer Rezoning Application No. 1148 to the October 14, 2002 Planning Commission meeting. A roll call vote on the motion resulted as follows:

AYES:	Smith, Johns, Heath, Glass, Wallace, Gilliland, Pilgrim
NAYS:	None
ABST:	None
ABSENT:	None

## **ITEM VII. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. O'Neill stated on behalf of Planning staff, an end of the year annual report is being presented to the Commission. He stated it has been an accepted practice to provide a report to the Commission of the responsibilities that the department fulfills, to give a status report on how staff is doing, and a glimpse into the future of staff's departmental roles to move the city forward. Mr. O'Neill discussed the mission and organization of the department, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof. Mr. Cannady, Coordinator of the Comprehensive Plan Team; Mr. Goetz, Coordinator of Physical Planning Team; Ms. Butler, Coordinator of the Current Planning Team; and Ms. McSmith, Coordinator of the Research and Analyst Team, presented their reports, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

In response to a question by Commissioner Heath regarding Current Planning, Ms. Butler stated the slide that showed the conditional privileges, rezonings and use permits has helped staff city-wide and district-wide to see both the number and type of applications that have occurred in the city. In terms of conditional privileges, at the end of the year, the information has shown staff that approximately five of the conditional privileges were for day cares which lets staff know that it is a use that is becoming more popular. Approximately eleven use permit applications were processed last year, and six of those use permits were for towers, which is also popular. This information lets staff look at the past year of what has been done, and be able to evaluate the type of applications that may occur in the future.

Mr. O'Neill stated it helps staff to understand what type of subject matter they need to know about (i.e. wireless communications, day cares). It also tells staff how they need to focus their professional development.

Mr. O'Neill stated although the Commission sees staff once a month, there are a lot of other things going on behind the scenes, and it is an amazing breath of work that staff has to do. He stated it is a pleasure for him to work beside them and see the type of work they can put together. He stated the presentation was a brief summary of symbolizing four predominant areas of work, and it is independent of being able to do what our mission statement is and bring together and integrate and depend on each of those areas to excel and work together to create the vision. Mr. O'Neill thanked staff for their presentation.

#### **ITEM VIII. ITEMS BY THE PUBLIC**

There were no items by the public.

#### **ITEM IX. MATTERS BY THE COMMISSION**

There were no matters by the Commission.

#### **ITEM X. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no additional items to come before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Terry P. O'Neill  
Secretary to Commission

APPROVED BY:

---

Perry T. Pilgrim  
Chairman